

June 1, 2018

Debrah C. Poplin, Clerk of Court  
Thomas A. Varlan, District Judge  
C. Clifford Shirley, Jr., Magistrate Judge  
800 Market Street  
Suite 130  
Knoxville, Tennessee (37902)

**FILED**  
**VIA CERTIFIED MAIL**

7017 1450 0000 3088 8750 JUN -5 P 1:38

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DIST. OF TENN.

Re: **No. 3:17-CR-82 - CONVICTION and SENTENCING**  
**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA vs. RANDALL KEITH BEANE, AND**  
**HEATHER ANN TUCCI-JARRAF**

Dear Clerk Poplin, Judge Varlan, and Judge Shirley:

We write to you as Concerned Americans regarding UNITED STATES OF AMERICA vs. Randall Keith Beane and Heather Ann Tucci-Jarraf. We want to make it clear that neither Mr. Beane nor Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf asked us to write this letter nor are they aware that we are writing this letter. We do not know Randall Keith Beane or Heather Ann Tucci-Jarraf personally. We only know of them and this case. We write this letter as much for Mr. Beane and Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf as for the country, the rule of law, and fellow-Americans. We are not lawyers and have no special knowledge of the law. We are Concerned Americans.

Randall Keith Beane and Heather Ann Tucci-Jarraf are living souls—God's creation. Please note that we do not have to know Mr. Beane or Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf to love them and appreciate what they have done, and continue to do, in bringing awareness to the depth of corruption in just about every system and level of government.

We are sending Mr. Beane and Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf a copy of this letter. We hope and pray they understand our heart compelled us to speak up and write this letter.

**Concern #1 – Brady v. Maryland**

We want to address Brady v. Maryland and exculpatory evidence. We are concerned Brady material was not presented to Mr. Beane, Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf, the jurors, or the court.

It was UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v MICHAEL T. FLYNN that brought Brady v. Maryland to our awareness. In UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v MICHAEL T. FLYNN, United States District Judge Emmet G. Sullivan made an order from the bench that special prosecutor Robert Mueller present all exculpatory evidence. In the order, Judge Sullivan wrote, "...**the government has a continuing obligation to produce all evidence...material either to guilt or to punishment**...holding that the obligation to disclose includes producing evidence "known only to police investigators and not to the prosecutor" and that "**the individual prosecutor has a duty to learn of any favorable evidence known**

to others acting on the government's behalf...including the police...holding that the duty to disclose exculpatory evidence applies even when there has been no request by the accused...Where doubt exists as to the usefulness of the evidence to the defendant, the government must resolve all such doubts in favor of full disclosure...Accordingly, the Court, sua sponte, directs the government to produce to defendant in a timely manner any evidence in its possession that is favorable to defendant and material either to defendant's guilt or punishment...if the government has identified any information which is favorable to the defendant but which the government believes not to be material, the government shall submit such information to the Court for in camera review..." (United States District Judge Emmet G. Sullivan Order Attached)

As you likely are aware, special prosecutor Robert Mueller has been investigating Russia "collusion" as it relates to the presidential campaign of President Donald J. Trump. What has come to light in that case is the misconduct and criminality of the Department of Justice and FBI investigators which includes falsifying FBI investigative report form 302. In General Michael Flynn's case it has been reported General Flynn pled guilty to lying to the FBI, but the FBI didn't think General Flynn lied. FBI agents falsified the 302 report form to make it look like they caught Gen. Flynn in a lie – all to charge Gen. Flynn with one count of lying to the FBI.

Are the American people expected to believe the FBI and Department of Justice (DOJ) engaged in this deep level of corruption and criminality, sedition and treason, as it relates to the President of the United States and General Michael Flynn, but not engage in the same type of corrupt behavior in this case?

### **Concern #2 – Probable Cause**

It's really not clear how the FBI investigation began in UNITED STATES OF AMERICA vs. RANDALL KEITH BEANE AND HEATHER ANN TUCCI-JARRAF. There was no OFFICIAL complaint. There was no affidavit. There was no warrant. There was no crime. What was the evidentiary basis for a "criminal" investigation in which there was no Constitutional or contractual violation? We believe the answer likely can be found in the exculpatory evidence in the possession of the United States Department of Justice and investigators.

Understanding the facts in UNITED STATES OF AMERICA vs. RANDALL KEITH BEANE AND HEATHER ANN TUCCI-JARRAF we ask—has a request been made of the prosecutors and investigators in this case to provide all exculpatory evidence? Have the prosecutors been asked to reveal any and all un-revealed possible conflicts of interest that go to motive for prosecution as well as provide exculpatory evidence?

No free man or woman is supposed to be seized or imprisoned, or stripped of his or her rights or possessions. And yet, FBI agent Parker Still—who has a combined seven and a half years as a private practice attorney and military JAG, as well as five and a half years with the FBI—gave the impression in his testimony he couldn't be bothered with "due process of law." It came across that Mr. Parker Still had judged Randall Keith Beane guilty long before he arrested Mr. Beane.

There is a Constitutional fourth Amendment against unreasonable searches and seizures and requiring probable cause for a warrant. There is a fifth Amendment guaranteeing procedural rights to which every person whom the government accused of a crime is entitled – “due process of law.” Mr. Parker Still and his FBI investigative “team” denied Mr. Beane and Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf both Constitutional protections. And as a quick reminder—the Constitution is the supreme Law of the Land. (Article VI – The Constitution of the United States)

It was extremely distressing to read the testimony of Mr. Parker Still in which he referred to a warrant as “...that’s some TV stuff where we serve people...that’s just not general practice where you would, you know, serve someone – hand someone a warrant, generally.” (Trial Transcript, Vol. 1, Pg. 69, Lines 13-17) It seems clear Mr. Parker Still believes FBI Investigators do not have to fulfill Constitutional obligations.

### **Concern #3 – Jurisdiction**

#### **Elements of Jurisdiction**

We have learned there are seven elements of jurisdiction, *all* of which must be proved by the prosecution if challenged. If not challenged, it will ALWAYS be assumed by the court that competent jurisdiction is proved and accepted by all parties. But jurisdiction was challenged and not effectively answered. The prosecution’s argument was weak at best and clearly not responsive to the normal seven issues of jurisdiction that must be addressed in every court case where jurisdiction is challenged. Below are the seven issues of jurisdiction we learned about and quote. According to case law, if any one of these seven is not proven beyond a reasonable doubt the case cannot continue:

1. The accused must be properly identified; identified in such a fashion there is no room for mistaken identity. The individual must be singled out from all others; otherwise, anyone could be subject to arrest and trial without benefit of “wrong party” defense. Almost always the means of identification is a person’s proper name, BUT, any means of identification is equally valid if said means differentiates the accused without doubt. However, there is no constitutionally valid requirement that you must identify yourself to the judge or to anyone. 4th Amendment - see *Brown v. Texas*, 443 US 47 and *Kolender v Lawson*, 461 US 352.

2. The statute of offense must be identified by its proper or common name. A number is insufficient. If a number were to be deemed sufficient government could bring new and different charges at any time by alleging clerical error. Sound familiar? We heard it in this case from prosecutors—something like—I’m sorry your Honor. We cited the wrong statute number. Can we fix this clerical error?

For any act to be triable as an offense, it must be declared to be a crime. Charges must negate any exception forming part of the statutory definition of an offense, by affirmative non-applicability. In other words, any charge must affirmatively negate any exception found in the law. Indictment or information is

defective unless every fact which is an element in a *prima facie* case of guilt is stated. The assumption of an element is not lawful.

3. The acts of alleged offense must be described in non- prejudicial language and detail so as to enable a person of average intelligence to understand the nature of the charge - the actual act or acts constituting the offense complained of. The charge must not be described by parroting the statute; not by the language of same. The naming of the acts of the offense describes a specific offense whereas the statute describes a general class of offense. Facts must be stated. Conclusions cannot be considered in the determination of probable cause.

4. The accuser must be named. He may be an officer or a third party. Some positively identifiable person (human being) must accuse. Some certain person must take responsibility for the making of the accusation, not an agency or an institution. This is the only valid means by which someone may begin to face his or her accuser. Also, the injured party (corpus delicti) must make the accusation. Hearsay evidence may not be provided. Anyone else testifying that he heard that another party was injured does not qualify as direct evidence.

5. The accusation must be made under penalty of perjury. If perjury cannot reach the accuser, there is no accusation. Otherwise, anyone may accuse another falsely without risk.

6. To comply with the five elements above, that is for the accusation to be valid, the accused must be accorded due process. Accuser must have complied with law, procedure and form in bringing the charge. This includes court-determined probable cause, summons and notice procedure. If lawful process may be abrogated in placing someone in jeopardy, then any means may be utilized to deprive a man or woman of his or her freedom.

7. The court must be one of competent jurisdiction. To have valid process, the tribunal must be a creature of its Constitution, in accord with the law of its creation – an Article III judge.

### Constitutional Areas of Jurisdiction

The Constitution of the United States mentions three areas of jurisdiction in which the courts may operate:

- (1) **Common Law** – Common Law is based on God’s Law. Anytime someone is charged under the Common Law, there must be a “damaged party.” Common Law cannot compel performance. Any violation of Common Law is a criminal act, and is punishable.

There is no damaged party in this case and we know this is not a Common Law case. In addition to the mental, physical, and emotional injuries likely sustained by Mr. Beane and Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf, the American people suffer mental and emotional injury at the hands of those who swore to protect and defend the Constitution against foreign **and domestic** enemies—but failed to do so.

- (2) **Equity Law** – Equity Law is law which “compels performance.” It compels you to perform to the exact letter of any contract that you are under. So, if you have compelled performance, there must be a contract somewhere, and you are being compelled to perform under the obligation of the contract. This can only be a civil action, not criminal. In Equity Jurisdiction, you cannot be tried criminally, but you can be compelled to perform to the letter of the contract.

We know there is no contract in this case because Mr. Beane and Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf, the living souls and the upper-case created corporate fiction, have not consented to contract. To have a valid contract all elements of a lawfully binding contract would have to be present, to include: parties competent to contract, free and genuine consent, full disclosure, sufficient consideration, certainty of terms, meeting of the minds, signatures or autographs, and privity of contract. If a contract is created without one’s knowledge or consent, you have created an illegal and unlawful private contract which is clearly null and void the moment an objection is made.

- (3) **Admiralty/Maritime Law** – This is civil jurisdiction of compelled performance which also has criminal penalties for not adhering to the letter of the contract, **but this only applies to international contracts.** (Admiralty – “...controversies arising out of acts done upon or relating to the sea, Admiralty does not extend to all navigable waters, but is limited to the ocean, navigable rivers running into the ocean, and the Great Lakes and their connections.” - Black’s Law Dictionary – Revised Fourth Addition, 1968 p. 144) (Maritime – “Pertaining to the sea or ocean or the navigation thereof; or to commerce conducted by navigation of the sea or (in America) of the great lakes and rivers.” – Black’s Law Dictionary – Revised Fourth Addition, 1968, p. 1197) There must be a valid international contract in force. Again, Mr. Beane and Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf have made it clear they do not consent to any agreements or contracts – implied, hidden, tacit or otherwise. There is no written contract presented as evidence that could justify the actions taken against Mr. Beane and Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf.

Lack of jurisdiction is a defense that is never waived and can be raised at any time – and it was raised in this case. FRCP Rule 12 (h)(3)—it states throughout case law that whenever it appears by suggestion of the parties or otherwise that the court lacks jurisdiction of the subject matter, the court shall dismiss the action. “Once jurisdiction is challenged, the court cannot proceed when it clearly appears that the court lacks jurisdiction, the court has no authority to reach merits, but, rather, should dismiss the action.” *Melo v. US*, 505 F2d 1026. “

As courts have often said: 'Where a court has jurisdiction, it has a right to decide every question which occurs in the cause; and, whether its decision be correct or otherwise, its judgment, until reversed, is regarded as binding in every other court: but, **if it act without authority, its judgments and orders are regarded as nullities. They are not voidable, but simply void.**' *Elliott v. Peirsol*, 1 Pet. 328, 340; *Wilcox v. Jackson*, 13 Pet. 498, 511; *Hickey v. Stewart*, 3 How. 750, 762; *Thompson v. Whitman*, 18 Wall. 457, 467.” IN RE SAWYER, 124 U.S. 200 \*

“Judgments entered where court lacked either subject matter or personal jurisdiction, or that were otherwise entered in violation of due process of law, must be set aside”, Jaffe and Asher v. Van Brunt, S.D.N.Y.1994. 158 F.R.D. 278.

The law requires proof of jurisdiction to appear on the record of the administrative agency and all administrative proceeding.” Hagans v. Lavine, 415 U. S. 533. Did this court have jurisdiction to hear and rule on UNITED STATES OF AMERICA vs. RANDALL KEITH BEANE, AND HEATHER ANN TUCCI-JARRAF? No. We don’t think so.

Not only do Mr. Beane and Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf have a right to know what jurisdiction you’re operating in but the American people also have a right to know under what jurisdiction Mr. Beane and Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf were prosecuted.

All bar attorney courts are commercial courts. Mr. Beane and Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf live upon the land. There is an obligation to obey the law of the land and yet the Law of the Land appears to have been violated.

The United States Constitution is declared to be the supreme law of the land. No state or local law or ordinance can take precedence over the Constitution’s provisions. The Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution establishes that the Constitution, federal laws made pursuant to it, and treaties made under its authority constitute the supreme law of the land. Specifically, Article VI, “This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.”

#### **Concern #4 – Who is the plaintiff?**

18 U.S. Code § 1956 (a) (1) (A) (i) refers to the jurisdiction of the United States. The plaintiff in this case is UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Is **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA** or the Delaware registered corporation **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC.** the same as **United States**? We don’t think so.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA does not have standing under Title 18. (18 U.S. Code § 5 - United States defined)

Under the rule of construction "expressio unius est exclusio alterius," where a statute or Constitution enumerates the things on which it is to operate or forbids certain things, it is ordinarily to be construed as excluding from its operation all those not expressly mentioned. The canon of construction holding that to express or include one thing implies the exclusion of the other, or of the alternative.

(Merriam-Webster – “a principle in statutory construction: when one or more things of a class are expressly mentioned others of the same class are excluded.”)

The definition statute does not mention UNITED STATES OF AMERICA therefore it is excluded from the statute. The expression of one thing is the exclusion of the other.

Mr. Beane and Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf have the right to face their accuser, but there is no accuser. There is the corporate UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. There is no accuser making an accusation.

A crime is by definition an offense committed against the "state." If USAA is the “victim” (per Mr. Parker Still testimony), what crime was committed against the state? A crime against the state would be treason, sedition, sabotage, espionage, terrorism, an enemy combatant, advocating the overthrow of our Constitutional form of government, or anything related to those things. If a living soul commits an offense against another living soul it is called a tort—not a crime.

There’s no accusation of any one of these things against Mr. Beane or Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf so why are they jailed? Why were they prosecuted by the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Corporation which has no standing under the statute put forward by the prosecutors?

#### **Concern #5 – Bank Accounts, Money, Credit**

Most Americans are now waking up to the fact that on December 23, 1913 the United States Congress passed the Federal Reserve Act in secret and at the request of corrupt bankers motivated by greed and a disdain for the American people. See President Bill Clinton’s Executive Order 13037 in which he calls the American people “human capital,” and UCC financing statement security commercial affidavit 1000362002066207, recorded on July 28, 2011, in which real estate is described as “all real men with hands and legs.” The collusion and conspiracy between the banks and the government is becoming more widely known. It was a conspiracy designed to enslave the American people – and an act of HIGH TREASON. It would seem all who continue to pursue innocent living souls or sit quiet and not speak against this high treason are complicit in the crimes.

Federal Reserve Notes are debt notes – not money – and yet the American people were forced to pay criminal bankers compound interest on debt notes created in thin air.

Banks don’t issue or loan money. They merely make bookkeeping entries, costing them nothing, and illegally using the credit of the American people.

As we understand it names and account numbers must match for a transaction to be successful. In our simple way of understanding banking, if it is your name and your account/social security number it is your account. We know that if we try to do an online banking transaction and the numbers are right the transaction goes through. If the numbers are wrong the system rejects the transaction. Is USAA, and every other Federal Reserve Bank, guilty of aggravated identity theft?

In exchange for using debt notes created by bankers, but only having value based on the credit of the American people, the American people have been forced into a slave relationship in which their labor, property, land, businesses, resources, freedom, and sometimes life -- is stolen by these same corrupt bankers whom Mr. Parker Still called a "victim." Federal Reserve Bank USAA has put banker corruption on full display in this case.

Understanding the banking history of our country, as we know everyone in this case does, everyone involved in this case would have to conclude the real criminals are the ones pretending to be the victim. Mr. Parker Still referred to USAA as a "victim" when in reality those working for USAA appear to be guilty of fraud, theft and high treason.

Hopefully you are aware of the work underway by US Military Intelligence to prosecute those who have committed HIGH TREASON against the American people.

Q (military intelligence) has made it clear in their post #138 below that "US Federal Reserve is a privately owned company..." Did the prosecutors present this exculpatory evidence to Mr. Beane, Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf, the jury and the court? (<http://qanonmap.github.io>, <https://qanonmap.bitbucket.io/>)

#### **Military Intelligence -- Q-Team Post #138**

Q !ITPb.qbhqo ID: gO/UntOB No.149063549 ■

Nov 11 2017 23:32:49 (EST)

Papua New Guinea: Bank of Papua New Guinea

Paraguay: Central Bank of Paraguay

Peru: Central Reserve Bank of Peru

Philip Pines: Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas

Poland: National Bank of Poland

Portugal: Bank of Portugal

Qatar: Qatar Central Bank

Romania: National Bank of Romania

Russia: Central Bank of Russia

Rwanda: National Bank of Rwanda

San Marino: Central Bank of the Republic of San Marino

Samoa: Central Bank of Samoa

Saudi Arabia: Saudi Arabian Monetary Agency

Senegal: Central Bank of West African States (BCEAO)

Serbia: National Bank of Serbia

Seychelles: Central Bank of Seychelles

Sierra Leone: Bank of Sierra Leone

Singapore: Monetary Authority of Singapore

Slovakia: National Bank of Slovakia

Slovenia: Bank of Slovenia

Solomon Islands: Central Bank of Solomon Islands

South Africa: South African Reserve Bank

Spain: Bank of Spain

Sri Lanka: Central Bank of Sri Lanka



Sudan: Bank of Sudan  
Surinam: Central Bank of Suriname  
Swaziland: The Central Bank of Swaziland  
Sweden: Sveriges Riksbank  
Switzerland: Swiss National Bank  
Tajikistan: National Bank of Tajikistan  
Tanzania: Bank of Tanzania  
Thailand: Bank of Thailand  
Togo: Central Bank of West African States (BCEAO)  
Tonga: National Reserve Bank of Tonga  
Trinidad and Tobago: Central Bank of Trinidad and Tobago  
Tunisia: Central Bank of Tunisia  
Turkey: Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey  
Uganda: Bank of Uganda  
Ukraine: National Bank of Ukraine  
United Arab Emirates: Central Bank of United Arab Emirates  
United Kingdom: Bank of England  
**United States: Federal Reserve, Federal Reserve Bank of New York**  
Vanuatu: Reserve Bank of Vanuatu  
Venezuela: Central Bank of Venezuela  
Vietnam: The State Bank of Vietnam  
Yemen: Central Bank of Yemen  
Zambia: Bank of Zambia  
Zimbabwe: Reserve Bank of Zimbabwe  
The FED and the IRS

**FACT: US Federal Reserve is a privately-owned company, sitting on its very own patch of land, immune to the US laws.**

Q

#### **Concern #6 – Fraud upon the Court**

Whenever any officer of the court commits fraud during a proceeding in the court, he/she is engaged in "fraud upon the court". In *Bulloch v. United States*, 763 F.2d 1115, 1121 (10th Cir. 1985), the court stated "Fraud upon the court is fraud where the impartial functions of the court have been directly corrupted."

It is well known that the courts in America have not adhered to the Constitution. There is no discussion of the Constitution in courtrooms. There appears to have been a conspiracy among politicians and those in the law community to overthrow our Constitutional form of government. It was replaced with contract law, specifically the Uniform Commercial Code, without the knowledge and consent of the American people.

Most Americans entering courtrooms have no idea what jurisdiction they are in or that their case is a contract case based on a contract they have no knowledge of and never agreed to. They have no idea the courts are operating under Admiralty/Maritime jurisdiction. They don't know international law or law

merchant was adopted into codes/statutes, and that decisions are based on commercial law or business law with criminal penalties attached.

Two living souls have been convicted of a non-existent crime against a corporation – UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. Given all courts are commercial courts, these two living souls, Mr. Beane and Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf, await a criminal penalty for a non-existent non-international no-contract case in a courtroom in which the court never stated its jurisdiction to hear or make rulings on the case.

The Constitution, Delaware corporation registry, UCC filings, name and social security number ownership, rules/laws governing contracts etcetera all go to well-known exculpatory evidence. We have little doubt the DOJ and FBI are in possession of that and more exculpatory evidence, but it seems to have been hidden from the jury—perhaps to achieve a conviction and attain an economic benefit for those pushing the seemingly fraudulent case?

If it is claimed USAA money was stolen by Mr. Beane, why was nothing done to seize the money? Mr. Parker Still says, “We seized the asset (RV) that was purchased with the stolen money.” (Trial Transcript, Vol. 1, Page 64, Line 12-13) Could it be that Mr. Beane, in fact, did not steal money or an RV? Does the opposite appear to have occurred? Was Mr. Beane’s money and RV stolen? It appears so.

US Constitutional law, contract law, and jurisdiction law are exculpatory evidence that does not appear to have been presented to the jury and the court in this case. And again, the Constitution is the supreme Law of the Land.

Was testimony and “evidence” presented to the jury in this case, wittingly or unwittingly, for the purpose of securing a conviction—and not justice? It appears so.

### **Concern #7 – The Rule of Law**

The only law is the Constitution (United States Constitution, Article VI) and every Civil Servant has an obligation to uphold the Constitution. Civil servants don’t over step their Constitutional duties. Civil Servants don’t violate a trust given to them. Civil Servants don’t advocate for the overthrow of the Constitution. And Civil Servants must never fail to prevent, or to aid in preventing, any deprivation of rights, under color of law, or any act of a conspiracy against the Constitution. And Civil Servants must never force a deprivation, under color of any State law, statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage, of any right, secured by the Constitution of the United States on any American.

So we ask why charges have not been pursued against those who appear to have violated the following:

#### **1) The United States Constitution – the “supreme Law of the Land”**

**2) 18 U.S. Code § 2236 - Searches without warrant**

Whoever, being an officer, agent, or employee of the United States or any department or agency thereof, engaged in the enforcement of any law of the United States, searches any private dwelling used and occupied as such dwelling without a warrant directing such search, or maliciously and without reasonable cause searches any other building or property without a search warrant, shall be fined under this title for a first offense; and, for a subsequent offense, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. This section shall not apply to any person—(a) serving a warrant of arrest; or (b) arresting or attempting to arrest a person committing or attempting to commit an offense in his presence, or who has committed or is suspected on reasonable grounds of having committed a felony; or (c) making a search at the request or invitation or with the consent of the occupant of the premises.

**3) 18 U.S. Code § 2234 - Authority exceeded in executing warrant**

Whoever, in executing a search warrant, willfully exceeds his authority or exercises it with unnecessary severity, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

**4) 18 U.S. Code § 2235 - Search warrant procured maliciously**

Whoever maliciously and without probable cause procures a search warrant to be issued and executed, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

**5) 18 U.S. Code § 242 - Deprivation of rights under color of law**

Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such person being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.

**6) 18 U.S. Code § 245 - Federally protected activities**

(b) Whoever, whether or not acting under color of law, by force or threat of force willfully injures, intimidates or interferes with, or attempts to injure, intimidate or interfere with— (B) participating in or enjoying any benefit, service, privilege, program, facility, or activity provided or administered by the United States; (C) applying for or enjoying employment, or any perquisite thereof, by any agency of the United States; shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both

7) **42 U.S. Code § 1983 - Civil action for deprivation of rights**

Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress.

8) **18 U.S. Code § 1918 - Disloyalty and asserting the right to strike against the Government**

Whoever violates the provision of section 7311 of title 5 that an individual may not accept or hold a position in the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia if he—

- (1) Advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government;
- (2) Is a member of an organization that he knows advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government;
- (3) Participates in a strike, or asserts the right to strike, against the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia; or
- (4) Is a member of an organization of employees of the Government of the United States or of individuals employed by the government of the District of Columbia that he knows asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia; shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year and a day, or both.

9) **18 U.S. Code § 1028A - Aggravated identity theft**

(a) **OFFENSES.—(1) IN GENERAL.**—Whoever, during and in relation to any felony violation enumerated in subsection (c), knowingly transfers, possesses, or uses, without lawful authority, a means of identification of another person shall, in addition to the punishment provided for such felony, be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 2 years. (c) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, the term “felony violation enumerated in subsection (c)” means any offense that is a felony violation of—(1) section 641 (relating to theft of public money, property, or rewards [1]), section 656 (relating to theft, embezzlement, or misapplication by bank officer or employee).

**Conclusion**

We ask that before Mr. Beane and Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf are sentenced to serve in prison all exculpatory evidence be turned over by the prosecution, FBI, and others and presented to the jurors, Mr. Beane, Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf, and the court for review. We have little doubt the verdict will be different upon examination.

We believe it is very safe to assume no jury would have found guilt had they possessed all exculpatory evidence. With all the news of DOJ and FBI criminality, we do not believe it's prudent to assume this case was prosecuted with full disclosure of any and all un-revealed conflicts of interest.

Those who have committed criminal offenses against other living souls deserve the consequence. Those accused of violation of a non-existent crime and/or non-existent contract and jailed have been injured and deserve redress.

We are aware that military intelligence has taken over investigations for the DOJ and FBI due to alleged their criminal conduct. The fact that military intelligence has taken over speaks to the depth of the alleged corruption at the Department of Justice and FBI. Military intelligence has acknowledged the alleged corruption extends beyond senior management to rank and file.

### **Military Intelligence Q-Team Post #11**

Anonymous ID: Eka5Om1K 147175452

Oct 29 2017 22:20:11 (EST)

Key:

#### **Military Intelligence v FBI CIA NSA**

No approval or congressional oversight

State Secrets upheld under SC

Who is the Commander and Chief of the military?

Under what article can the President **impose MI take over investigations for the 3 letter** agencies? What conditions must present itself? Why is this so VERY important? Who surrounds POTUS? They lost this very important power \_ the one area of the govt not corrupt and directly serves POTUS.

(MI has the most access to mined data and classified information. They have the best information gathering tools, They also have more power in general and are devoted to the constitution. MI can take over the investigations for the other three in cases of high treason. **No approval or congressional oversight**)

### **Military Intelligence Q-Team Post #586**

Q !UW.yye1fxo ID: 6189f8 130638

Jan 22 2018 21:47:32 (EST)

What would happen if texts originating from a FBI agent to several **[internals]** discussed the assassination (possibility) of the POTUS or member of his family?

What if the texts suggest foreign allies were involved?

Forget the Russia set up **[1 of 22]**.

This is only the beginning.

Be careful what you wish for.  
AS THE WORLD TURNS.  
Could messages such as those be publicly disclosed?  
What happens to the FBI?  
What happens to the DOJ?  
What happens to special counsel?  
What happens in general?

**Every FBI/DOJ prev case could be challenged.**

**Lawless.**

Think logically.  
We haven't started the drops re: human trafficking / sacrifices [yet][worst].  
Those [good] who know cannot sleep.  
Those [good] who know cannot find peace.  
Those [good] who know will not rest until those responsible are held accountable.  
Nobody can possibly imagine the pure evil and corruption out there.  
Those you trust are the most guilty of sin.  
Who are we taught to trust?  
If you are religious, PRAY.  
60% must remain private [at least] - for humanity.

**These people should be hanging.**

Q

#### **Military Intelligence Q-Team Post #1334**

Q !4pRcUA0IBE 76 ■  
May 10 2018 22:31:03 (EST)

**Rank & File.**

**DOJ, FBI, C\_A, State.**

**[G-2][Collect]**

**[SIS Good].**

Not Forgotten.

Overcome.

As Concerned Americans, we want to know that all exculpatory evidence was presented to the jury, Mr. Beane, Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf, and the court.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA vs. RANDALL KEITH BEANE AND HEATHER ANN TUCCI-JARRAF is based on an alleged violation of 18 U.S. Code § 1956 (a) (1) (A) (i) – “**with the intent to promote the carrying on of specified unlawful activity...**” It was never demonstrated Mr. Beane or Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf promoted or carried on an unlawful activity.

We feel certain no patriotic American would want innocent fellow-Americans wrongfully, illegally, and unlawfully jailed when they have not committed a crime.

How many others are illegally and unlawfully detained, jailed or imprisoned for judgments in these commercial courts on alleged debt instruments and fraudulent unconscious contracts?

We think we can comfortably say that everyone involved in prosecuting this case is highly educated with access to highly skilled attorneys and unlimited resources. If we, uneducated Americans, can identify the issues with this case, it's a near certainty those with professional legal training fully understand all the legal issues.

We came across the following case in which it makes clear the obligation everyone has: "WHEREAS, officials and even judges have no immunity (See, Owen vs. City of Independence, 100 S Ct. 1398; Maine vs. Thiboutot, 100 S. Ct. 2502; and Hafer vs. Melo, 502 U.S. 21); officials and judges are deemed to know the law and sworn to uphold the law; officials and judges cannot claim to act in good faith in willful deprivation of law, they certainly cannot plead ignorance of the law, even the Citizen cannot plead ignorance of the law, the courts have ruled there is no such thing as ignorance of the law, it is ludicrous for learned officials and judges to plead ignorance of the law therefore there is no immunity, judicial or otherwise, in matters of rights secured by the Constitution for the United States. See: Title 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983.

If no one can claim ignorance of the law then EVERY ONE knows the Constitution is the SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND.

Was this prosecution done purposely with malice and reckless disregard for the lives of two innocent living souls? We hope not but it appears so.

We can only imagine the emotional distress and mental anguish Mr. Beane and Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf have suffered unnecessarily. To allow innocent souls to continue to be jailed with full knowledge and awareness of the perversion of the Constitution would be downright criminal.

If any facts or statements presented are inaccurate we apologize. However, we feel certain there is enough accuracy to make clear Mr. Beane and Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf are illegally and unlawfully jailed.

Mr. Beane and Mrs. Tucci-Jarraf were not prosecuted based on Constitutional law. They were not prosecuted based on lawful or legal contract law. Title 18 of the United States Code, entitled Crimes and Criminal Procedure, refers to United States not UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and was allegedly codified and enacted into positive law -- but by whose authority? Article I, Section 8 of the constitution does not appear to give congress the authority to create Title 18 to be used against the American people.

It is very, very, very difficult for us to know two innocent living souls sit in jail when they should be free. We would think that would bother you as well.

We thank you for your time and consideration of our concerns. We send love and appreciation to all devoted to protecting the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and most importantly, the God-given rights of all living souls.

Sincerely,

Concerned Americans  
Robinson Family, et al.

Copy: James Douglas Overbey, United States Attorney  
Cynthia F. Davidson, Esquire, Assistant United States Attorney  
Anne-Marie Solto, Esquire, Assistant United States Attorney  
800 Market Street  
Suite 211  
Knoxville, Tennessee (37902)  
Certified Mail #7017 3040 0000 6638 7440

Randall K. Beane, #55002  
132 Cotton Drive  
Ocilla, Georgia (31774)  
Certified Mail #7017 3040 0000 6638 7457

Heather Ann Tucci-Jarraf, #1369008  
5001 Maloneyville Road  
Knoxville, TN (37918)  
Certified Mail #7017 3040 0000 6638 7464

Christopher Wray  
FBI Headquarters  
935 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. (20535-0001)  
Certified Mail #7017 3040 0000 6638 7471

Jeff Sessions  
U.S. Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC (20530-0001)  
Certified Mail #7017 3040 0000 6638 7488

Michael E. Horowitz  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Office of the Inspector General  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.,  
Suite 4706  
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001  
Certified Mail #7017 1450 0000 3088 8743

Attachment: Judge Emmet G. Sullivan Order



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
	)	
v.	)	Criminal No. 17-232-01 (EGS)
	)	
MICHAEL T. FLYNN,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

ORDER

Pursuant to *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), and its progeny, the government has a continuing obligation to produce all evidence required by the law and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. See *id.*, 373 U.S. at 87 (holding that due process requires disclosure of "evidence [that] is material either to guilt or to punishment" upon request); *Kyles v. Whitley*, 514 U.S. 419, 437-38 (1995) (holding that the obligation to disclose includes producing evidence "known only to police investigators and not to the prosecutor" and that "the individual prosecutor has a duty to learn of any favorable evidence known to others acting on the government's behalf . . . , including the police"); *United States v. Agurs*, 427 U.S. 97, 107 (1976) (holding that the duty to disclose exculpatory evidence applies even when there has been no request by the accused); *Giglio v. United States*, 405 U.S. 150, 153-55 (1972)

(holding that *Brady* encompasses impeachment evidence); *see also* Fed. R. Crim. P. 16(a) (outlining information subject to government disclosure); *United States v. Marshall*, 132 F.3d 63, 67-68 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (holding that the disclosure requirements of Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 16(a)(1)(C) apply to inculpatory, as well as exculpatory, evidence).

The government's *Brady* obligation to provide exculpatory evidence in a timely manner is not diminished by the fact that such evidence also constitutes evidence that must be produced later pursuant to the Jencks Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3500, or by the fact that such evidence need not be produced according to Rule 16. *See United States v. Tarantino*, 846 F.2d 1384, 1414 n.11 (D.C. Cir. 1988); *see also* Advisory Committee Note to Fed. R. Crim. P. 16 (1974) ("The rule is intended to prescribe the minimum amount of discovery to which the parties are entitled."). Where doubt exists as to the usefulness of the evidence to the defendant, the government must resolve all such doubts in favor of full disclosure. *See United States v. Paxson*, 861 F.2d 730, 737 (D.C. Cir. 1988).

Accordingly, the Court, *sua sponte*, directs the government to produce to defendant in a timely manner any evidence in its possession that is favorable to defendant and material either to defendant's guilt or punishment. This government responsibility includes producing, during plea negotiations, any exculpatory

evidence in the government's possession.<sup>1</sup> The government is further directed to produce all discoverable evidence in a readily usable form. For example, the government must produce documents as they are kept in the usual course of business or must organize and label them clearly. The government must also produce electronically-stored information in a form in which it is ordinarily maintained unless the form is not readily usable, in which case the government is directed to produce it in a readily-usable form. If the information already exists or was memorialized in a tangible format, such as a document or

---

<sup>1</sup>See *United States v. Ruiz*, 536 U.S. 622, 633 (2002) (government not required "to disclose material impeachment evidence prior to entering a plea agreement with a criminal defendant"); *United States v. Moussaoui*, 591 F.3d 263, 286 (4th Cir. 2010) (noting that the "Supreme Court has not addressed the question of whether the *Brady* right to exculpatory information, in contrast to impeachment information, might be extended to the guilty plea context") (emphases in the original); *United States v. Ohiri*, 133 F. App'x 555, 562 (10th Cir. 2005) ("By holding in *Ruiz* that the government committed no due process violation by requiring a defendant to waive her right to impeachment evidence before indictment in order to accept a fast-track plea, the Supreme Court did not imply that the government may avoid the consequence of a *Brady* violation if the defendant accepts an eleventh-hour plea agreement while ignorant of withheld exculpatory evidence in the government's possession."); *McCann v. Mangialardi*, 337 F.3d 782, 788 (7th Cir. 2003) (noting that "given th[e significant distinction between impeachment information and exculpatory evidence of actual innocence], it is highly likely that the Supreme Court would find a violation of the Due Process Clause if prosecutors or other relevant government actors have knowledge of a criminal defendant's factual innocence but fail to disclose such information to a defendant before he enters into a guilty plea"); *United States v. Nelson*, 979 F. Supp. 2d 123, 135-36 (D.D.C. 2013) ("Because the prosecution suppressed exculpatory evidence before Nelson pled guilty, Nelson's due process rights were violated to his prejudice and his guilty plea was not voluntary and knowing."); *Buffey v. Ballard*, 782 S.E.2d 204, 221 (W. Va. 2015) (finding "that the DNA results were favorable, suppressed, and material to the defense," and therefore "the Petitioner's due process rights, as enunciated in *Brady*, were violated by the State's suppression of that exculpatory evidence"). But see *United States v. Conroy*, 567 F.3d 174, 179 (5th Cir. 2009) (disagreeing with the proposition that, based on *Ruiz*, "exculpatory evidence is different [from impeachment information] and must be turned over before entry of a plea").


recording, the information shall be produced in that format. If the information does not exist in such a format and, as a result, the government is providing the information in a summary format, the summary must include sufficient detail and specificity to enable the defense to assess its relevance and potential usefulness.

Finally, if the government has identified any information which is favorable to the defendant but which the government believes not to be material, the government shall submit such information to the Court for *in camera* review.


**SO ORDERED.**

**Signed: Emmet G. Sullivan  
United States District Judge  
February 16, 2018**

P.O. Box 378  
Glenn Dale, Maryland (20769)



7017 1450 0000 3088 8750



37902

R2303S100988-21

\$4.58

U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
BOWIE, MD  
JUN 02 18  
AMOUNT

JUN 0 2018

Court  
District of Tennessee  
At Knoxville

Debrah C. Poplin, Clerk of Court  
Thomas A. Varlan, District Judge  
C. Clifford Shirley, Jr., Magistrate Judge  
800 Market Street  
Suite 130  
Knoxville, Tennessee (37902)